REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I.   STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-3 and 5-13 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, and 7 are hereby amended. Claim 4 was previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 11-13 are new. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification, specifically at pages 13-14 and figure 2.

Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

II.   REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, § 102(b) AND § 103(a)

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,644,364 to Kurtze (Hereinafter, merely "Kurtze").

Claims 6, 9, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,644,364 to Kurtze in view of Official Notice.

III.   RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 2 is hereby amended, therefore obviating rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

"…**wherein the single specified value is proportional to a value of a specific picture element component of the plurality of specific picture elements of the first image included in picture element components A of the first image when said value of the specific picture element is not zero,**

wherein the picture element components A and the picture element components B comprise a luminance component Y and a color difference component selected from two color difference components according to sampling frequencies of the two color difference components." (emphasis added)

As understood by Applicant, Kurtze relates to providing a media pipleline with two channels for processing sequences of digital still pictures.

First, the Office Action (see page 5) relies on column 4, lines 3-27 of Kurtze to disclose <u>wherein the single specified value is proportional to a value of a specific picture element component of the plurality of specific picture elements of the first image included in picture element components A of the first image when said value of the specific picture element is not zero</u>, as recited in claim 1. The cited portion of Kurtze discloses that a blending coefficient α can be determined according to $|k_c\text{-}U|$. Applicant submits that Kurtze only discloses that α can be determined according to $|k_c\text{-}U|$ but <u>fails to teach that a blending coefficient α can be proportional to $|k_c\text{-}U|$</u>. Applicant further submits that Kurtze's $|k_c\text{-}U|$ is not <u>a value of a specific picture element component of the plurality of specific picture elements of the first image included in picture element components A of the first image</u>, as claimed in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Kurtze fails to teach the above-identified features of claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable.

Second, the Office Action (see page 6) relies on column 3, lines 25-57 and column 4, lines 3-27 of Kurtze to disclose <u>wherein the picture element components A and the picture element components B comprise a luminance component Y and a color difference component selected from two color difference components according to sampling frequencies of the two color difference components</u>, as recited in claim 1. In the cited portion, Kurtze discloses that only Y or U, V are keyed and processed. Applicant submits that Kurtze's keying process is to determine a blending coefficient α regardless of sampling frequencies of U and V. Applicant respectfully submits that nothing in Kurtze has been found that teaches <u>the picture element components A and the picture element components B comprise a luminance component Y and a color difference component selected from two color difference components according to sampling frequencies of the two color difference components</u>, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claim 7, which recites similar features, is also patentable.

IV.   DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

U.S. Appln. No. 09/818,399
Reply to Non-Final Office Action dated July 19, 2007

PATENT
450100-03044

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By _____
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800

Frommer Lawrence & Haug LLP
745 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10151
212-588-0800

Page 12 of 12

00498787.DOC